

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/28/2009 has been entered.
2. Claims 1 and 16 have been amended. Claims 1-30 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7,10-13,16-22, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonnell et al(hereinafter referred as McDonnell) US 7,512,234 B2 in view of Kubo et al(hereinafter referred as Kubo) US Patent No 7,007168 B2 and further in view of Heller et al (herein after referred as Heller) US Patent No 3,793,634
5. As per claims 1, 16: McDonnell discloses a method/computer readable medium for identification processing and comparison of location coordinate data in a confidential and anonymous manner comprising: receiving, in a computer, a plurality of fixed coordinates, represents a location of an item more than one process (See col.9 lines 44-47(i.e., obtain location data)); utilizing, in the computer, a cryptographic algorithm to process the plurality of fixed

coordinates forming a processed data (See col.6 lines 49-56 and col.9 lines 56-60(i.e., encrypt location data)).

McDonnell does not explicitly teach comparing, in the computer, the encrypted fixed coordinates of the processed data to at least a portion of secondary data that comprises one or more encrypted fixed coordinates to determine whether a relationship exists between the encrypted fixed coordinates of the processed data and the encrypted fixed coordinates of the secondary data.

However Kubo teaches comparing the encrypted fixed coordinates of the processed data to at least a portion of secondary data that comprises one or more encrypted fixed coordinates to determine whether a match exists between the encrypted fixed coordinates of the processed data and the encrypted fixed coordinates of the secondary data (See col. 10 lines 18-27, col. 16 lines 39-67 and Figs18A, Fig 23 steps S 193-195)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at that time the invention was made to employ the teachings method of Kubo within Denning method in order to provide delivering encrypted information in a communication network using location data.

The combination of McDonnell and Kubo does not explicitly teach the plurality of fixed coordinates being generated by more than one process.

However Heller teaches the plurality of fixed coordinates being generated by more than one process (See col.8 lines 6-21).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teaching method of Heller within the combination of

McDonnell and Kubo in order to provide a system tracking a target by digital techniques (See Heller col. 2 lines 23-25).

6. As per claims 2,17: the combination of McDonnell-Kubo-Heller teach further comprising the step of receiving data representing the location of the item and determining the plurality of fixed coordinates that represent the location of the item prior to receiving the plurality of fixed coordinates (See McDonnell col.3 lines 41-51 and col.9 lines 44-47).

7. As per claims 3, 18: the combination of McDonnell-Kubo-Heller teach the method further comprising the step of storing the processed data in a database (See col.11 lines 25-39).

8. As per claims 4,19: the combination of McDonnell-Kubo-Heller teach the method wherein the step of comparing the processed data to at least a portion of secondary data includes the secondary data comprising data previously stored in a database (See Kubo col. 10 lines 18-27 and Figs18A, Fig 23 steps S 193-195).

9. As per claims 5,20: the combination of McDonnell-Kubo-Heller teach the method further comprising the step of matching the processed data to the at least a portion of secondary data that is determined to reflect an identical one of the plurality of fixed coordinates (See Kubo col. 10 lines 18-27 and Figs18A, Fig 23 steps S 193-195).

10. As per claims 6, 21: the combination of McDonnell-Kubo-Heller teach the method further comprising the step of issuing a signal based upon a user-defined rule (See McDonnell col.8 lines 16-29).

11. As per claims 7,22: the combination of McDonnell-Kubo-Heller teach the method wherein the step of determining the plurality of fixed coordinates that represent the location occurs in relation to a grid (See Kubo col. 19 lines 54-58).

12. As per claims 10, 25: the combination of McDonnell-Kubo-Heller teach the method wherein the grid is a multi-dimensional grid (See Kubo col. 19 lines 54-58).

13. As per claims 11, 26: the combination of McDonnell-Kubo-Heller teach the method wherein the grid is based upon a user-defined criterion (See Kubo col. 19 lines 54-58).

14. As per claims 12, 27: the combination of McDonnell-Kubo-Heller teach the method wherein the user-defined criterion corresponds with quantity (See Kubo col. 19 lines 54-58).

15. As per claims 13, 28: the combination of McDonnell-Kubo-Heller teach the method wherein the user-defined criterion corresponds to time (See Kubo col. 14 lines 30-40).

16. Claims 14-15,29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonnell et al(hereinafter referred as McDonnell) US 7,512,234 B2 in view of Kubo et al(hereinafter referred as Kubo) US Patent No 7,007168 B2 and further in view of Heller et al (herein after referred as Heller) US Patent No 3,793,634 and further more in view of Denning et al(hereinafter referred as Denning) US 7,143,289 B2.

17. As per claims 14, 29: the combination of McDonnell-Kubo-Heller teach claim 1 as recited above. McDonnell-Kubo-Heller does not explicitly teach the method wherein the step of determining the plurality of fixed coordinates that represent the location includes the step of determining a nearest of the plurality of fixed coordinates. However Denning teaches the method wherein the step of determining the plurality of fixed coordinates that represent the location includes the step of determining a nearest of the plurality of fixed coordinates (See Denning Fig

steps 504,143,140 and col. 7 lines 35-45). Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at that time the invention was made to employ the teachings method of Denning method within McDonnell-Kubo-Heller method in order to provide delivering encrypted information in a communication network using location data.

18. As per claims 15,30: the combination of McDonnell-Kubo-Heller-Denning teach the method wherein the step of determining a plurality of fixed coordinates that represent the location includes the step of determining the plurality of fixed coordinates surrounding the location (See Denning Fig steps 504,143,140 and col. 7 lines 35-45).

19. **Claims 8-9,23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonnell et al(hereinafter referred as McDonnell) US 7,512,234 B2 in view of Kubo et al(hereinafter referred as Kubo) US Patent No 7,007168 B2 and further in view of Heller et al (herein after referred as Heller) US Patent No 3,793,634 and further more in view of Clapper(US Pub No 2003/0108202)**

20. As per claims 8-9 and 23-24: the combination of McDonnell –Kubo-Heller teach claims 7 and 22 as recited above. The combinations of McDonnell-Kubo-Heller do not explicitly teach the method wherein the grid comprises a uniform grid and non-uniform grid. However Clapper discloses the method wherein the grid comprises a uniform and non-uniform grid (See 0018).Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at that time the invention was made to modify the teaching method of Clapper within McDonnell-Kubo-Heller method in order to determine location.

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO 892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fikremariam Yalew whose telephone number is 5712723852. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-4195.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Fikremariam Yalew/
Examiner, Art Unit 2436
01/08/2010

/Nasser Moazzami/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2436